

A.R.
C. XII
Victoria

SOME FURTHER FACTS
CONCERNING
FEDERATION

BY
NATHANAEL BURWASH, S.T.D.,

Chancellor, Victoria College.

[Reprinted from *Methodist Magazine* of February, 1890.]

3426
27/2/96

Some Further Facts Concerning Federation.

BY NATHANAEL BURWASH, S.T.D.,

Chancellor, Victoria University.

[Reprinted from *Methodist Magazine* of February, 1900.]

It affords me no little pleasure to accept the opening paragraph of the Rev. J. Allen's "Facts concerning Federation." I quite agree with Dr. Harris, whom he quotes, that "the first and greatest need" of a university "is men." "Get strong, well qualified, thoroughly competent men for professors, and you have your university." I quite agree with him also in his commendation of the method pursued so largely in Victoria for obtaining those men. But in making this statement, as the foundation of what he professes to be a careful and trustworthy investigation of what is required to build up a university quite adequate to meet all the wants of the Methodist people of Ontario, he has condemned his own work. He tells us a great deal about the cost of apparatus and of libraries, and he has visited a dozen universities, and travelled a couple of thousand miles, to learn that we need to expend less than twenty thousand dollars on these two supplemental requisites of a university; and he has left us without the first line of information as to what it will cost to equip a fairly efficient Methodist University in this Province with the necessary number of "strong, well qualified, thoroughly competent men."

The expense of this fundamental part of an independent university will, of course, depend upon the salaries paid and the number of men to be employed. As to the salaries, I take it for granted that neither Mr. Allen, nor the alumni to whom he speaks, nor the Methodist Church, expect to find "strong, well qualified, thoroughly competent men" who will work for less than a respectable living. And he surely cannot pretend that \$2,000 a year is an extravagant salary in a town like Cobourg; or that \$2,500 is beyond the mark in the city of Toronto. If he questions this, I can only refer him to those of our present staff who have families to support, and let him ask them if they can live on less. He need not travel a thousand miles from home to ascertain that fact.

The second question, How many men must we employ? involves three considerations: (1) the number of students to be taught; (2) the nature and extent of the course or courses of study; (3) the character of the colleges with which we must compete.

1. I may take it for granted that we should make provision for

two hundred students in Arts. I select this number because we enrol nearly that number now each year, and because it represents as large a number as can be efficiently provided for by a single staff. A college with less than a hundred students can be worked on a half staff, because with small numbers the classes can be doubled; and more than half the colleges of the United States come under this class, and are carried on with from five to seven men; they are really "one-horse" colleges, ploughing with half a team.

(2) As to the nature of the course of study, I shall take for granted that Mr. Allen and his friends do not propose to lower the standard either of matriculation, or of graduation, to the B. A. degree. I shall, therefore, consider that three lectures a day in Literature and Mathematics, and two, with the necessary laboratory preparation, in Science, represent full work for a professor. If Mr. Allen had inquired, he would have found that this is from fifty to a hundred per cent. heavier work than is performed by the professors in most of the celebrated colleges he has visited. I shall take it for granted that three hours a day represents a reasonable amount of instruction for a pass student, and three and a half on the average for an honour student. This is the almost universal rule for pass-work in the United States, and has been our rule in Victoria for many years.

As to the extent of the course or courses of study, the amount of work done in each department, and also the number of departments admitted, the answer must depend upon the question of options. On this question of options, Mr. Allen is pleased to insinuate that I am just waking up to this modern question, and accepting "fashions of the hour" "when the hour is past and the fashions are old." If this means anything to Mr. Allen's purpose, it means that we are going back again to the old fixed course. Nothing but strange unacquaintance with the history of the university movement of England and America for the last forty years could make a man bold enough to venture such an assertion. Options and optional courses have been abused, and those who have been my associates in work know that I have been no advocate of a "free-lunch system." But so long as the B. A. degree continues to be the common university degree, and represents the scholastic training with which our best men enter upon their preparation for their special calling or profession, that B. A. degree must represent at least five or six optional courses. Your clergymen, lawyers, and a part of the teaching profession will require Classics or Philosophy. Your engineers, manufacturers, and medical men will require Mathematics or Science. Your commercial men

your journalists, and your politicians will require Modern Languages and History, or History and Civil Polity, and your teachers will require at least three out of the last four. Five of these parallel optional courses are fully recognized by McGill, Queen's and Victoria to-day, as well as by Toronto; and our whole system of public education in Ontario is based upon their recognition.

This breadth of optional work will disappear only when the B. A. degree disappears from our university, and the work now represented by it is mostly relegated to the gymnasium or collegiate institute, as it is now in Germany, and then these preliminary courses may be reduced to two—a course principally literary, with Science and Mathematics supplementary; and a course principally scientific and mathematical, with Languages and Literature supplementary. This is President Gilman's ideal. The college in Johns Hopkins is but a preparatory school. And his ideal of the future before the denominational colleges of the United States is that they should become such preparatory schools. The United States has no such system of secondary education supported by Government as has grown up in Ontario; and President Gilman and others in the United States expect the entire mass of denominational colleges to sink into a secondary position, or rather to recognize the fact that they now occupy only a secondary position; and that in the university work of the future they must be content to be feeders to half a dozen great national universities. No one who is intimate with the history and resources of some of these denominational colleges can expect such a result. A unification of the higher education of the United States I do not expect along this line. If ever it is reached it implies the extinction of the denominational colleges as fountain heads of national thought. They will become mere distributors of that which emanates from the great centres.

But this is a question of the future, and of the future of the United States and not of Canada. Our position differs from that of the United States in this, that we have laid the foundations of a national system complete in itself, from the Kindergarten to the University. We must either find a place for the denominational colleges in that system (and federation offers them such a place at the fountain head of intellectual and moral influence of the whole system), or else they must be content to work their way in solitary independence outside the common unity of the national system. If any one else can solve the problem of their incorporation in some more satisfactory way, I shall be quite content to step aside and permit him to make the attempt. The past history

of the question does not seem to me to afford him very great encouragement. The opponents of federation think this task is accomplished, if they can prove that some moderately efficient form of independence is possible. They forget that for the Methodistism of the future independence may not be a blessing if it separates them from the common literary brotherhood of their fellow-citizens, and fosters a spirit of narrow suspicion toward those with whom they must dwell in a common country. They forget, too, that another independent university may be still less of a blessing to the country at large, if it limits the free and full growth of such a common university as our country is able to sustain.

(3) But to return to our estimate of cost. The third consideration in estimating the number of professors necessary is the competition which we must meet. Now, that is a very different thing to-day from what it was in the summer of 1886. At that date Toronto University, including the School of Practical Science, had a staff of nine professors, three tutors, and six lecturers—eighteen in all. To-day, her staff embraces thirteen professors, eight lecturers, and eight fellows, covering fifteen distinct departments, to which are added five collateral sub-departments.

In 1886, Queen's was furnished with a staff of eight professors and eight lecturers and tutors, covering ten departments. To-day, she has twelve professors and eight lecturers and tutors, covering thirteen departments. In 1886, Latin and Greek History and English Literature, French and German, and in one instance Mathematics and Physics, were united in single departments, and in some cases manned by a single lecturer or tutor. Now these are everywhere separated, in most cases with separate professors, or at least with a strong lecturer in charge. The estimate which in 1886 would have placed us in advance of sister institutions, would be entirely inadequate for that purpose to-day. The subdivision of work, instead of being at the maximum in 1886, has advanced by fully one-third in the last three years in Ontario at least, and is scarcely at its maximum yet. The learned lecturer who has travelled his thousands of miles to gather his facts in a foreign land has been utterly blind to what is going on at his own doors. And even in the foreign land where he discovered that options have reached their maximum, he forgot to inquire, or at least to tell us, what that maximum was, and how it compares with the more conservative position of our Canadian universities.

The sum of all this is, that to maintain an independent university to-day in our surroundings, we require the following staff: A professor each in Latin, Greek, Orientals, English, French,

German, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geology and Mineralogy, Metaphysics, Moral Philosophy, and History and Civil Polity, fourteen professors in arts, with two in Theology, giving us a staff of sixteen in all.

In estimating the amount which we now require for independence, we must also take into account an increased debt, and a reduced rate of interest, calling for a larger endowment than was needed three years ago.

Now about other estimates, I need not quarrel with Mr. Allen. In 1886, I asked only \$24,000 to repair the old buildings and make proper additions to library and apparatus. I shall now gladly accept his offer of \$20,000 for apparatus and library. And as I, too, have since travelled, and have seen something of the attention paid in other colleges to physical health and comfort, I shall ask for \$50,000, a part of which I should propose to spend in finishing the basement of Faraday Hall, building a wing absolutely needed for a working laboratory in Chemistry, and putting in lower ceilings to make the comfortable and economical heating of the building possible. With the other part I should add a chapel and some additional commodious lecture rooms to the old building, put the whole building in thorough repair, and furnish both buildings with modern ventilation and heating throughout.

We are now prepared for a revised estimate of the present cost of independence in Cobourg :

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. To cover debt, improvements to buildings, library and apparatus | \$120,000 |
| 2. Required income, 10 professors | \$32,000 |
| Library apparatus, care of buildings, laboratories, and incidentals | \$8,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$40,000 |
| Less fees and Educational Society | 10,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$30,000 |
| At six per cent. | \$500,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$620,000 |
| To this we have assets | 145,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| Leaving to be raised | \$477,000 |

If I reckon endowment at five per cent. interest, we must add \$100,000 more.

Now, in all this I have followed Mr. Allen's figures wherever he favours us with any. In all other things I have been governed by the actual facts as they exist in neighbouring institutions in

our own country. These figures will be quite sufficient to expose the utter fallacy of the last ten pages of Mr. Allen's pamphlet. The estimate presented in 1886 is no guide in 1890. Had the friends of independence come forward with \$300,000 in 1886, independence would have been fairly possible, though, like Queen's, we should have been asking for another quarter of a million by this time. But to say that what would do in 1886 will serve now, is to reckon without the facts. Now let us turn to independence in Toronto:

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. For debt, equipment, and removal from Cobourg, say | \$100,000 |
| For new buildings | 250,000 |
| 2. Add to annual expenditure 25 per cent. . | \$50,000 |
| Less Educational Society and fees | 10,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$40,000 |
| Requiring endowment at 6 per cent. | 670,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$1,020,000 |
| Less present assets | 145,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| To be raised | \$865,000 |
| Less Mr. Gooderham's bequest | 200,000 |

But some will be ready to say, does not the requirement for federation also need revision? It does, but very slightly. The requirements of Mr. Gooderham's will may make our buildings and equipment more costly, and our debt is larger, thanks in part to the men who are putting us to the heavy expense of litigation:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| For debt and new buildings we may now estimate. . | \$350,000 |
| Annual expenditure, 10 professors | \$25,000 |
| Incidentals | 5,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$30,000 |
| Less Educational Society and fees | 10,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$20,000 |
| Requiring endowment at 6 per cent. | \$340,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$690,000 |
| Less present assets | 145,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$545,000 |
| To which there is now subscribed and bequeathed. . | 435,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| Leaving to be secured | \$110,000 |

Now these are the present facts:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| We have yet to raise for independence in Cobourg | \$477,000 |
| For independence in Toronto | 665,000 |
| For federation | 110,000 |

These in each case are net sums.

But all this, Mr. Allen insinuates, is based upon a perversion of the system of options which the higher intelligence of the age is just about to discard. And he calls our attention to the examples of Johns Hopkins and Yale as the patterns of the conservative type by which we should mend the perversity of our ways. Our estimates are based upon the standard university curriculum of this Province, now virtually in force in Toronto, Queen's and Victoria. Has Mr. Allen taken the trouble to compare this curriculum carefully with his two conservative types? I trow not. Here, again, he might have learned something nearer home.

1. He has learned that Johns Hopkins provides seven parallel courses, allowing the student his choice among the seven. He does not seem to have learned that in each of these so-called fixed courses there are subordinate options, extending in some cases to one-third the course. Now let us compare this with the present course of Toronto University, which virtually governs our provincial curriculum, and is the *bête noir* of Mr. Allen and his friends in view of federation. Toronto now offers seven distinct honour courses, in each of which there is far less optional matter than is found in any of the seven courses of Johns Hopkins. Our Canadian curriculum for honour students is quite as conservative as that of Johns Hopkins. For pass students it is far more rigid, especially in Toronto. Victoria and Queen's allow a little more latitude, but in no case do they equal the liberty allowed by the seven courses of Johns Hopkins. The Canadian pass course is virtually twofold; a classical course, with Latin, Greek and Hebrew; and a modern course, with Latin, French and German. The variations from this are not greater than are allowed in some of the seven fixed courses of the Johns Hopkins. Next, let us compare our Canadian curriculum with that of Yale. In Yale, during the first two years, Latin, Greek, Mathematics, English for one year are fixed subjects. French and German are optional, and there is no Hebrew or Science. In Toronto, and Ontario generally, Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Science and one year's English are fixed; Greek and Hebrew, French and German are optional.

In Yale, during the third year, Physics, Astronomy, Logic and Psychology are fixed. In the senior year, Psychology, Ethics and

Theism are fixed subjects. For the balance of his work during these two years each student has an option among *ninety-five* subjects.

To sum up: In Yale, out of the sixty hours a week of the four years' pass course, twenty-five are optional. The five hours in the first two years are defined options. The twenty hours in the last two years as indefinite as in the "free-lunch" system of Harvard, and embrace selections from the lectures of thirty-three different professors. In Toronto, of the sixty hours a week of the four years' pass course, options are allowed to the same extent of twenty-five hours a week. These options are all strictly defined. Twenty hours out of the twenty-five consist in a choice between two Ancient and two Modern Languages; two hours of a choice between three Sciences, and the balance of an option between Metaphysics and Mathematics. Our provincial course then, so far as pass men are concerned, is on the whole more conservative than that of Yale, and Yale is the most conservative of the leading American universities.

Let us now compare the Yale course with our own on the point of specialism. Specialization is a matter quite distinct from options. Options, as allowed in some of the American colleges, may completely destroy the character and defeat the end of a university course, and yet may not make a man a specialist. In the ordinary course, about one-half the time of the student is devoted to Languages and Literature, and by this course he is brought into contact with the best models of thought and expression, ancient and modern, and his style of thought and expression is moulded accordingly. The other half is devoted to the close, deductive reasoning of Mathematics, to the inductive study of Science, and to the broad generalizations and first principles of Philosophy. And the object of this balanced course is the development of the full intellectual manhood. It is the higher, or rather the highest, education. If options are carefully guarded, they need not interfere with this. For instance, considerable freedom of option may be allowed as between various languages and literature, though some think that the Greek literature with its philosophy and its deep human sympathies is a *sine qua non*. A choice may be allowed between four or five fundamental branches of science which press for recognition; and in both Mathematics and Philosophy the field has now become so broad, that a choice must be made either by the university or by the student. This we conceive to be the rational basis and the proper limit of options; and within these limits, and on this basis, may be safely used to suit the tastes or prospective wants of the student.

The entire scheme of university, or perhaps, I should rather call it college, outfit which I have estimated in this paper, provides for nothing beyond this reasonable limit. It provides for the six most important languages (three ancient and three modern languages), absolutely needed under our present circumstances. It provides a limited course in Mathematics and Physics, and in three important branches of Science; and it affords instruction in the two great branches of Philosophy, and in History and Civil Polity. There are no dainties in this bill of fare, but simply the substantial necessities, with such variety as is absolutely demanded by our present wants. But specialism looks in quite another direction from that which we have been considering. Its object is not culture or intellectual development, but learning. A man desires such a perfect knowledge of some one department as will enable him to turn it to practical account as a teacher, or in some other line of practical life.

Now, it is very easy to say that a college should pay no attention to specialties in its undergraduate course, but that these, as professional in their character, should be entirely relegated to a post-graduate course. This would certainly be desirable. And some would consider it desirable that this post-graduate course should always be taken in the Old World. But practically neither the one nor the other is always or even frequently possible. Nor is that latter necessary, nor perhaps even desirable. It is not necessary, because if we wisely economize our forces we can do the work at home. It is not desirable, because such a course, like the importation of all our manufactures from abroad, would prevent our ever reaching the full development of our own national manhood. Now, in attempting to make this provision for specialism in our Ontario universities, we have so far been forced to attempt to provide for it in the B. A. course. We have limited specialism to honour men. And, as in the options of the pass course, these honour courses are each carefully defined, and the attempt is made to secure the breadth of true university culture with the special learning in some one department which will fit a man to be a teacher or a practical worker in that department. Even Yale, with its large resources, has not passed altogether beyond this method of specialism. It also offers special honours in seven departments at graduation, and students seeking these honours are specially provided for in the ninety-five optional courses already referred to. The practical result of this system is quite in the line of our Ontario system. But no educator can regard this system as sufficient in itself to provide for the special learning required by the country. In so far as it does so it unduly limits

the general culture. Or if the general culture is maintained, the special training is too limited. Hence the necessity for the post-graduate courses provided for by Yale.

But the moment we mention post-graduate courses, we are told that our country is too young for post-graduate courses, and that a full generation must pass by before we are in a position to do anything on that line. And yet Yale, Mr. Allen's type of conservative perfection in method of university work, has had her post-graduate courses for a quarter of a century. They are, of course, not the post-graduate courses of Germany, nor are they such imitations of Germany as are given in Johns Hopkins. But they serve the American teacher and the practical American scientist quite as well as either. There are seven of these courses, each extending over three years; the first year being chiefly the honour work in Yale of the corresponding department in the senior year, but required of all students who have not taken that honour work or its equivalent. The course results in the degree of Ph.D., and the student who has done it justice is fairly well equipped to teach his department in any intermediate school or in the ordinary college.

Now this is the post-graduate course which the advocates of federation have before their minds for Ontario, not a mere system of examination with paper degrees; but first, a remodelling of the honour course, broadening and strengthening its fixed elements, and reducing its special line of study in proportion; and then adding two years of work under able professors, for the special benefit of teachers and others who require special learning in one particular branch of knowledge. I do not say that this is an ultimatum, and that the day will not come when Ontario may furnish to her own sons, and to the sons of the other younger provinces, all that Germany now offers. But the full advantages for post-graduate special study now offered at Yale might be furnished in Toronto under federation within five years. Such provision would at once add to the efficiency of our High Schools and Collegiate Institutes; it would give higher power to our whole educational system; and it would furnish the Province with trained scientists for the better development of our rich natural resources.

The great difficulty which has prevented such provision in the past has been our divisions and sectional jealousies. But now that the Province is thoroughly alive to the importance of this matter, such provision will be made, and those who stand outside and refuse to accept their natural share in these provisions, must be content to occupy a secondary position in the intellectual life of our country; some such position as President Gilman designates

as the appropriate sphere of the denominational colleges; or, as another eminent educational authority recently pointed out, as the sphere of the *country colleges*. Such a position the Christian Church cannot afford to occupy. Such a position I am persuaded the Methodist Church of this country will not consent to occupy. Christianity must make its influence fully felt at the very fountain head of our higher intellectual life. And, unless I am mistaken, Methodism is determined to do her full share in this great work.

It has been one of the standing complaints of the opponents of federation that it will reduce the field of work open to us. The whole tenor of Mr. Allen's argument is to show how little is needed for independence. All that we need is a little cheap apparatus and a few cheap books (and he would not, I am sure, think of adding a few cheap professors), and we can have an independent university. We can dispense with all our options and limit ourselves to two courses, a literary and a scientific. That is true. We can do that. But if we do it, our graduates will be excluded from the teaching profession, we will lose our students, and our position will be very speedily reduced to that of a "mere theological school," and that in a little rural town. No. Wherever we do our work, and under whatever policy, we must provide for our sons all that can be had elsewhere. We must furnish them with no cheap mediocrity, but the very best that the land can afford. And it is the chief advantage of federation that it will enable us to do this more efficiently, more economically, and with a wider influence for good, both to our country and to ourselves, than any other scheme.